

MAR 3 1964

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000100170022-2
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

22-2

March 3

4112

operating the way it was operating in the old or current premises should make up the selling price allowable to the person who has to move to make way for any civic improvement—freeway, redevelopment, etc.”

Another: “I do think the Government should be realistic in all appraisals and watch out for the deceit and fraud practiced by persons with insider information on project locations, whereby some people make a lot of money.”

Another: “The compensation for reestablishing a business should have a reasonable relationship to the comparable costs for the business establishment in the original location, based on prior records of the business concerned.”

Another: “I think the Government should compensate the businessman if he is forced to move from an established location. If the law is too liberal, however, a great number of businessmen are going to take advantage of a given situation, and try to make money by charging the Government with all sorts of costs and losses. Compensation, and other adjustments due to Government projects should be based on Federal income tax reports prior to the project and after the project went into effect. This is the only true yardstick whether the move by a business to another location was detrimental or perhaps quite beneficial to the business. A situation of this nature will occur to a great many of the businesses along U.S. Highways 36-40 in Denver, Colo., after interstate 70 will bypass the main business arteries in Denver in approximately 15 months. We have formed a merchants group, just to work out plans how to minimize the loss of business due to the new highway. These projects naturally affect small businesses to a much larger extent than heavy industry, or large companies.”

Another: “This [compensation] should be open negotiation and handled on a business-like basis. Naturally, there will be differences and there will be those on both sides trying to take unfair advantage. Some form of arbitration can be worked out on these few. I believe 99 percent can fairly negotiate so that small business will not be hurt.”

Another: “This is a very touchy problem and about every project has a different effect on business. I think every locality should have a locally appointed seven member board of independent businessmen to judge what to do about these situations, then approved by the U.S. Government.”

Another: “Fair market value should be paid for properties taken over, based on value prior to the determination that such properties need to be purchased for the Government project. The period for determining fair market value should be at least 6 months prior to final determination of the project.”

Another: “Actual losses should be paid in full. Intangibles should be considered, but weighed carefully. A system of impartial, knowledgeable referees to arbitrate these matters might be useful.”

Another: “No blanket law should cover all cases. Real estate boards or arbitration boards should be used to determine losses. Provisions should be built in to protect the Government (taxpayers) against opportunists.”

Another: “What is just compensation? Man owns plant and has for many years. Plant has been maintained and modernized. He should be compensated not on assessed value or even appraised value but on actual cost of equal facilities. If the Government did not require his moving, he could go on for many years without such expenditure. Why must he be put to added costs without compensation. However, if he moves to another city or State which furnishes plant free and even tax free, some penalty should

be forthcoming to compensate community he leaves for loss of payroll, etc.”

What about damages to areas not immediately adjacent to area of construction? Sometimes blasting, etc., alters rock formations even miles from area, causing settling that otherwise would not have occurred. Many other factors, such as traffic flow, are also altered far from project. Some relief should accrue.

To sum up our findings in this survey, they show:

1. Relocation is a very costly process for many independents. Many experience losses for which they are not adequately compensated.

2. While compensation is judged inadequate, a majority of those who have moved report that it was not a factor in compelling business retrenchment.

3. There is support for liberalized compensation, however it extends only into the areas of tangibles—items like machinery, equipment, fixtures, moving costs, et cetera, which are readily verifiable, and not into the area of intangibles—items like living costs, lost income, et cetera, which are not so easily verifiable.

4. While there is support for liberalized compensation, there is also strong insistence that this be provided with strict safeguards for the public purse.

5. Despite the difficulties encountered by those who had completed their moves and those left in fringe areas, and despite the difficulties anticipated by those facing the need to move:

(a) A significant number (60 percent) of firms which had completed their moves reported income as great as or greater than that in their old locations, as against 40 percent of those left behind in the fringe area.

(b) Three of the 79 firms in these categories reported having to close down their operations—due because of seemingly poor redevelopment planning, one because of diversion of a highway necessary to his trade, and one for reasons that are not clearly indicated.

6. There is, seemingly, a great need for improved informational procedures for the benefit of firms affected by these programs.

7. While there is some criticism of the concepts—chiefly urban redevelopment and ARA, chief criticism is over the need for improvement in the laws and the procedures involved in them.

DOMESTIC BEEF SITUATION GROWS STEADILY WORSE

(Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. NELSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past four months, while the domestic beef situation has grown steadily worse as a tremendous volume of foreign beef products flowed into this country, the administration has been asking us to avoid the introduction of legislation to establish limitations. Furthermore, we have been asked not even to talk publicly about the matter lest we upset our balance of trade with Australia, or endanger our negotiating position with the Common Market.

We were assured the voluntary negotiations then being conducted with Australia and New Zealand would produce a remedy for the problem. The negotiations have concluded, but the results are a long way from the cure. Moreover, they are a slap in the face of the American cattle industry.

It has become quite clear that unless beef imports from these two countries, plus the tons of beef products coming to Florida ports from Latin America are curtailed, our domestic cattle industry faces a multimillion dollar loss.

While we are standing here today a flotilla of ships is approaching the United States from Australia loaded down with more than 30 million pounds of beef. This is equal to 72,545 head of cattle. This means American producers must retain this number of cattle on their ranches, resulting in increased costs, in the loss of labor for handling, slaughtering, and butchering. In short, it means a multimillion dollar loss to the Nation's economy.

Today, I have introduced a bill to limit beef imports to half of the 5-year average prior to December 31, 1963.

This will offer prompt relief to our domestic producers while still maintaining the United States as a fair market for foreign producers.

We are well aware of the value of the favorable balance of trade, but we cannot stand by and watch our American cattlemen go down the drain. Unless we take immediate action this may happen.

The time for action is now. Every day we delay costs our cattle producers untold thousands of dollars.

ARTICLE CHARGES U.S. AGENCIES PENETRATED BY REDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I addressed the House and commented on the article which appeared in the Monday, March 3, 1964, New York Journal-American. It points out charges which certainly should be investigated so the American people can know the truth in this important matter. It is no secret that the State Department has been working hard to conjure up the picture of Soviet Communists as “maturing” and “responsible” world leaders who are gradually shaking off their rough ways. Our foreign policy is based on an unreal appraisal of our sworn adversaries and as a part of this effort, the American people have been deluged with propaganda. The Journal-American article presents a direct contrast to the pie-in-the-sky approach of the State Department and it should be thoroughly aired by a congressional committee which would be free of the builtin restraint of alibi on its own failures.

The Journal-American article concerns one Michal Goleniewski, a defector from the Soviet secret police, who has proven a valuable informer in the past but, according to the story written by Guy Richards, has many further stories to tell concerning Red penetration of our State Department and even the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Goleniewski received the following endorsement last year when the Congress passed a private bill providing for his naturalization:

per said: "(Only) to maintain equivalent operations as before, but policed to prevent excess gains." A second commented: "If they don't try to set up on a much larger scale than before." A third commented: "It is only fair to expect help in relocating, that is, in difference in cost of land, increase in cost of building. Salvage value should be taken into consideration." A fourth said: "Only on the basis of equipment equal to the old location—not a new, more expensive setup." On the other hand, one commented: "It is rarely possible to replace comparable facilities without paying much more for them than is received for the old."

As to the question of moving costs, one member commented: "The Government should pay only for removing. Such things as advertising, good will, loss of potential profits are nebulous and open the door for graft as well as Government control. Many areas are degenerating and some would go broke anyway. Depreciation is liberal enough for replacing equipment."

A second significant pattern emerges from the votes on these questions: support for changes was weakest among firms which had completed their moves. One might speculate that this was due to the fact they might feel: "We've made our way through relocation under current allowances. Others should be able to do so." This might be true but for one fact: They did support some of the changes, and in some of the changes they opposed, the other groups joined them. This emphasizes a matter which we mentioned earlier, the need for adequate information for all affected by development programs.

III

And now, let's take a further look at some of the relocation problems, experienced and hypothesized, by those who answered the questionnaire.

One businessman speculated (commenting on compensation for renters and owners): "We can only make statements in the light of how the loss of our building might affect us. In our own situation, for instance: We own our own building and conduct a small garment manufacturing business which could be operated in any location which might be centrally located and easy for our help to reach. However, we are (my wife and I run this business as a team) at retirement age now but will continue to operate the business as long as our health permits. However, we plan on this building, which is on an arterial street, to become our prime source of income when we retire." If this building were taken from us and we were not adequately recompensed we could suffer considerable hardship. There must be other cases similar."

Another who had already moved and was experiencing some difficulty, commented: "Our situation was due to urban renewal project—2½ years have passed and still no real progress in redevelopment of that area. Why must premature moves be necessary? Our business was only 1½ years old at the time and it worked a real hardship on us. Under normal conditions our move was imprudent and premature, but we had no choice."

Another who had already moved (a renter) said: "Prior to remodeling of the office interior, inquiry was made to the landlord whether or not our office will be forced to move in the near future. The reply was that he didn't think so. With the go-ahead statement our company invested about \$3,000 in remodeling of the interior. All the expenses involved in this improvement were lost due to eviction. Nothing could be recovered."

Another who had already moved stated: "Relocation has caused me to purchase and use two additional pieces of transportation due to the fact that my business is a service

that must be performed on the customer's premises. This is additional overhead that had not been considered by the Government and so far since relocating (2 years ago) I haven't been able to increase my volume of business to compensate for this added overhead and I have suffered a decrease in volume."

A businessman facing prospects of having to move said "We are in an old structure with rentals included (apartments). We were in the right of way of a proposed freeway, which we favored, but whose location has been shifted, but now we may be involved in a new underpass project, or street reconstruction, possibly both, both of which we are for. But, our location is very important, as an extremely potent competitor is ideally situated to take nearly all of our dropin trade if we move more than a block or two. Dropin trade used to be a very small part of our business, but it is now over one-half of it and increasing. This is a very difficult business to develop in a new location. Our outside business over the phone would tolerate a fairly long move without loss—the amount depending on whether we change phone numbers, and to which exchange if to a new exchange. Our "purchase of property" arrangements are a family affair and quite involved as far as compensation would be involved. (This location of 31 years and we are known by our location.) We would be unable to obtain property or rental of a store within our "zone" at anywhere near the "overhead" we have at our present location, therefore, a complete change in our mode of operation may be required. We believe any business should be helped to recover from losses caused by construction, helped even if there is an improvement of status, but we are against cash payment in the form of a "dole" as this principle of compensation can be too easily abused by a "smart wise-guy" businessman and his lawyer. In addition to compensation for direct losses there needs to be help at finding a suitable location and in getting low cost financing for any improvements that may be needed to reestablish the business at a level at least as good as the original operation was."

Another facing prospects of having to move, commented: "There is a tendency on a Federal and State level to appraise property considerably lower than going rate, thus forcing condemnation. Aside from being costly to owners, Government usually winds up paying considerably more than owners would have accepted through negotiation. Some officials have frankly admitted that condemnation takes them off the hook."

A businessman in a fringe area had this to say: "Apparently most of the problem is caused by failure to require Government officials (employees, actually, regardless of grade) to consider the rights of all citizens and negotiate with them in good faith before completing a design of construction. Further, in dealing with these people, city, State, or Federal, I find most of them inexperienced or lacking in ordinary logic, common law, and understanding of what makes this country go. To give an example, as a recession measure in 1958, the Federal Government supplied the funds to build a four-lane freeway 2 miles long in front of my place of business. As they excavated the whole 2 miles 5-feet deep and then filled back about 3 feet, I couldn't tell what was going on until it was a 'fait accompli,' I had a nice front (auto parts business), I ended with no access from the front. A 6-foot bank in front of my parking area. The roadbed on a 20-degree angle whereas it had been level; a long island in the freeway which compels people coming from one direction to make a circuitous two-block drive to get in and I was virtually out of business for 5 months in 1959. What has this cost me? I don't know. I made \$40,000 net in 1962 but it was the hard way—70, 80, and 90 hours a

week. My property value ruined after an original \$40,000 investment and 8 years of hardest labor."

Another in a fringe area said: "We are located in the center of the block directly across the street from the new Federal courthouse and office building. Our additional cost is due to demolition of the private garage and parking space where we kept our trucks and maintained customer parking. We were forced to rent additional property for parking at \$100 a month and probably will be forced to move because of the increased value of property in the area and increase in rent when our lease expires."

One businessman comments, interestingly: "We expect to be benefited by the flood control project. Certain areas of our city are flooded every year, but the location of our business only when there is a major flood. The deepest water stood from 27 to 40 inches in lower floor. There is where we have most and heaviest equipment and mill supplies, etc. We would in no way be entitled to compensation on account of the project, but feel many will. It is a great undertaking to move, even though it entails no real financial loss."

Another businessman speculated: "If the factors controlling income received in a business change, naturally it is usually over a period of time, and the businessmen should be able to take these factors into consideration either to adjust them in his present location or to plan to move to another location. However, when the Government redevelops it is usually a total upheaval in the vicinity having immediate and total consequences, and the businessman has absolutely no control over what happens. He is at the mercy of a Government edict, and for this reason I think that the Government must pay compensation for their actions. The small businessman is usually in an older district because he doesn't have the financial resources to locate in the newer, more modern, and more profitable locations. When the older districts are redeveloped and new apartments and stores are built in these areas the small businessmen located in these areas must stand by and see financier-backed businesses take over because he, himself, cannot afford to open up these high rent locations. He also cannot always move into another older, low cost business district because they usually have their own established firms. So it comes down to this: His place of business is taken over, he cannot get a job because of his age, he has no unemployment compensation, or sufficient funds to keep him for any length of time, so he ends up as an unemployment statistic and eventually on relief rolls."

IV

What further suggestions did our members have? Let's take a look at a few of these:

One said: "There should be some consideration given business as to first choice on renting or buying property in a redeveloped area that is still suitable for the same type of business at the same price they were bought out at. Many businesses simply move completely out of the area and are lost for tax purposes."

Another said: "Since residents of property are offered comparable living facilities, or the refusal, other occupants (nonresidential such as businesses uses) should have the same offer. Costs of relocating, loss of productive time, wiring, and other installations that cannot be moved, as well as downtime and actual moving expenses should be part of the appraisal of the value of the moving, as well as the actual value of the premises. If the benefit to the people as a whole is established, then the property owner occupant should not be forced to sacrifice more than any other citizen to make the improvement possible. A fair market value for the property plus a fair evaluation of the moving and reestablishing of the business

His services to the United States rate as truly significant. * * * He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk.

I include at this point in the RECORD the committee report and the public law which accomplished Mr. Goleniewski's naturalization:

SENATE REPORT NO. 437, CALENDAR NO. 417,
88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary (to accompany H.R. 5507).)

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5507) for the relief of Michal Goleniewski, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization, and to exempt him from the provisions of section 313 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 40-year-old native and citizen of Poland, who has been admitted to the United States for permanent residence and is employed by the U.S. Government. He was a member of the Communist Party in Poland before his defection in April 1958. His services to the United States are rated as truly significant.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated May 15, 1963, to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the case, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., May 15, 1963.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (H.R. 5507) for the relief of Michal Goleniewski, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary.

The bill would waive the provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act which prohibits the naturalization of aliens who were within the subversive classes during a period of 10 years immediately preceding the filing of a petition for naturalization. The bill would also grant the beneficiary sufficient residence and physical presence in the United States for naturalization and permit him to file a petition in any court having naturalization jurisdiction. The committee may desire to amend line 3 to reflect the beneficiary's correct given name as Michal.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

"MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES
RE H.R. 5507

"The beneficiary, Michal Goleniewski, a native and citizen of Poland, was born August 16, 1922, in Nieswiez. His wife, Irmgard, is a native of Berlin and a citizen of Germany. They are now living in the United States. The beneficiary's education was all in Poland: in 1939 he graduated from the Gymnasium; he completed 3 years of law at the University of Poznan, and in 1956 he received a master's degree in political science from the University of Warsaw. He enlisted in the Polish Army in 1945 and was commis-

sioned a lieutenant colonel in 1955, which rank he held until coming to the United States in 1961. He is now employed as a consultant by the U.S. Government.

"The beneficiary's one prior marriage terminated in divorce in Poland in 1957. He married Irmgard Kampf in 1961. Both the beneficiary and his present wife are permanent residents of the United States, having been lawfully admitted as of January 12, 1961.

"Mr. Goleniewski was a member of the Communist Party of Poland from January 1946 until April 1958, when he defected. Without the enactment of H.R. 5507 the beneficiary will not be eligible for naturalization prior to 1968.

"The Immigration and Naturalization Service has been advised that the contributions made by Mr. Goleniewski to the security of the United States are rated by the U.S. Government as truly significant. He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk. He continues to make major contributions to the national security of the United States. * * * His primary motivation in offering to work with the Government has been and remains his desire to counter the menace of Soviet communism. * * *

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (H.R. 5507) should be enacted.

[Private Law 88-59, 88th Cong., H.R. 5507,
Aug. 28, 1963]

AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF MICHAL GOLENIEWSKI

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Michal Goleniewski, lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, shall be held to be included in the class of applicants for naturalization exempted from the provisions of section 313(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as such class is specified in section 313(c) of the said Act, and that Michal Goleniewski shall be considered to have met the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316(a) of the said Act, and his petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

Approved August 28, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, in viewing our foreign policy operations and internal security we can only appraise that part of the iceberg that appears above the surface. Even a cursory examination of what we know has transpired casts doubt on the wisdom of State Department policies. At a time when we are told we can "do business" with the Communists—even extend them credit on wheat sales—what does the record disclose? Have they stopped their subversion here and abroad? Of course not. Consider only a few of the 1963 subversion highlights that come to mind:

July 1: The State Department ordered Gennadi G. Sevastyanov, a Soviet Embassy cultural attaché in Washington to leave the United States for attempting to recruit a Russian-born employee of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency as a Russian spy.

July 2: The Federal Bureau of Investigation arrested four persons and charged them with conspiring to spy for the Soviet Union. Ivan D. Egorov, a personnel officer at the United Nations, and his wife, Aleksandra, were arrested in New York and later sent back to the Soviet Union in return for two Americans held by the Russians. Also ar-

rested were a Washington couple using the names of Robert and Joy Ann Baitch.

July 19: A Federal court jury in New York convicted Navy Yeoman Nelson C. Drummond of conspiracy to commit espionage for the Soviet Union. He received life imprisonment.

October 10: The Defense Department disclosed that SFC Jack E. Dunlap, a former clerk-messenger for the National Security Agency, had sold secrets to the Soviet Union over a 2-year period before committing suicide last July.

October 29: The FBI arrested an American electronics engineer and a chauffeur for a Russian trading agency on spy conspiracy charges. Two Soviet diplomats were arrested and then released because they had diplomatic immunity. A third Soviet diplomat was named in charges filed by the FBI but he was not apprehended.

No wonder the public is concerned about the double standard of the State Department and the laxity in our internal security. Testimony of Michal Goleniewski is the part of the iceberg that is below the surface and judging by how bad the exposed part is it is high time that we delve into the recesses and see what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the Monday, March 2 article entitled "U.S. Secret Agencies Penetrated by Reds," and the Tuesday, March 3 article entitled "Probe Four U.S. Envoys in Red Spy Sex Net." It is interesting to note that the official line will probably be that Michal Goleniewski is emotionally unstable and irrational. This was what they said about Paul Bang-Jensen.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 2, 1964]

U.S. SECRET AGENCIES PENETRATED BY REDS (By Guy Richards)

A defector from the Soviet Secret Police has informed U.S. officials that Moscow has placed active cells in the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department in Washington and overseas.

The Red defector, a high-ranking operative in Russia's KGB, is sure that the cells are still operative in the two highly sensitive Government agencies.

He and his wife have been living in a modest apartment not more than 30 minutes from Times Square. He has been given a new name and identity especially fabricated to blot out his past and help him blend into the American scenery.

He has named names. He has provided Washington with details of what looms as a greater scandal than the famous Alger Hiss case. Here are some of his shattering disclosures:

Approximately \$1.2 million of CIA funds in Vienna recently was passed secretly along to the Communists—one-third to KGB (the Soviet Secret Police), one-third to the Italian Communist Party and one-third to the American Communist Party.

Three American scientists with access to defense secrets are working for the KGB. They have ties to others in the same category whose identities are unknown to him. But he has clues to a number of them.

KGB has been able to infiltrate all American embassies in important cities abroad and "every U.S. agency except the FBI."

Little, if anything, has been done to run down or clean out the KGB men on American payrolls though he fed the facts and exposures on them to the CIA starting as far back as 1960.

4114

Instead of having his information used for the cleanout job he came here for, he charges, he has been thwarted by amateurs and Stalinists in the CIA and even kept from communicating his plight to responsible higher officials here.

These allegations have been made by a former high executive of both the Russian and Polish secret police organizations. He had his own plane. He was free to fly all over Europe and did.

He is Michal Goleniewski, 41, a husky and handsome Polish-born agent who resembles the Hollywood prototype of the suave, lady-killing spy. He's credited with breaking the Irwin N. Scarbeck spy case in Warsaw in 1961. The CIA is on record in Congress as endorsing these observations:

"His services to the United States are rated as truly significant. * * * He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk."

Though he has yet to testify on espionage matters before any committee of the Senate or House, which he wants to do, and which many legislators want him to do, his case has become the center of one of the biggest behind-the-scenes battles ever to rear up in the jurisdictional area between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

In the tussle over him things have happened which seem incredible in a democratic nation.

A congressional subpoena was virtually smuggled to him—then mysteriously quashed. A letter he wrote to a Congressman was intercepted. An Army colonel who visited him was later hounded and investigated.

Michael Goleniewski might still be living in unheralded torment if a Cleveland, Ohio, Congressman hadn't scented a slightly fishy odor in a routine office proceeding.

The time was last summer. The scene was Capitol Hill, in the office of the chairman of the House Immigration Subcommittee. Sitting at his desk was white-plumed, bespectacled, Ohio Democrat, Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, a graduate of Princeton and Harvard Law School, and a good friend of the late President Kennedy.

By his side was a man from the CIA. The latter showed the Congressman a report and proposed bill which would bestow on Michael Goleniewski the benediction of U.S. citizenship. The former KGB agent's truly significant services were duly chronicled in the report. It stated, in part:

"The beneficiary, Michael Goleniewski, a native and citizen of Poland, was born August 16, 1922, in Nieswiez. His wife, Irmgard, is a native of Berlin and a citizen of Germany. They are now living in the United States.

"The beneficiary's education was all in Poland: in 1919 he graduated from the Gymnasium; he completed 3 years of law at the University of Poznan, and in 1956 he received a master's degree in political science from the University of Warsaw.

REPORT COVERS HELP TO UNITED STATES

"He enlisted in the Polish Army in 1946 and was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in 1955, which rank he held until coming to the United States in 1961 (after breaking the Scarbeck case.) He is now employed as a consultant by the U.S. Government."

After a brief digression, the report continued:

"Mr. Goleniewski was a member of the Communist Party of Poland from January 1946, until April 1958, when he defected. Without the enactment of the H.R. 5507 (the proposed bill) the beneficiary will not be eligible for naturalization prior to 1968.

"The Immigration and Naturalization Service has been advised that the contributions made by Mr. Goleniewski to the secur-

ity of the United States are rated by the U.S. Government as truly significant.

"He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk. He continues to make major contributions to the national security of the United States. * * * His primary motivation in offering to work with the Government has been and remains his desire to counter the menace of Soviet communism."

GIVES VIEWS TO CIA MAN

This report and the bill it was designed to expedite had one primary motive. It was, in the words of a congressional aid, "to wipe out the past of a Polish citizen and create a man who never was, an American citizen with a new name, a new identity and a new status, free to find a new life here."

Representative FEIGHAN was thoroughly aware of the purpose of the report. He was sympathetic. A man with a long record of fighting subversives, and often stubbornly independent of the executive branch, he is known for his special dislike of being turned into a rubberstamp by any Government agency.

He expressed his views to the CIA men. He said he was shocked at the amount of detail presented about Goleniewski. He said he had heard reports about the KGB defector, but had never laid eyes on him. He remarked he didn't like to promote any legislation on a pig-in-the-poke basis and concluded with the request:

"I'd like to see the live body."

His request was carried back to higher CIA officials. There were several days of dickering and phoning back and forth between CIA and Congress.

This bore light on two horizons of growing importance in security matters:

(a) The fact that the executive branch controls CIA, State, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, and FBI—all the intelligence-gathering agencies—and jealously guards its rights to run out all adverse criticism of these units' performance.

(b) The personal situations of defectors vary greatly. Some, like Yuri Nossenko, have been publicized. Some have not. Some bring adverse criticism of American operations. Some do not. Some have families behind the Iron Curtain whose safety is endangered by publicity here. Some don't.

Goleniewski had his wife with him. He also had plenty of adverse criticism to deliver about U.S. operations.

On the ticklish issue of whether he should be allowed to see a Member of the legislative branch, the wheels began to whir in the heavily guarded CIA Building in Langley, Va., 12 miles outside Washington.

SECRET SESSION SET ON THE HILL

It was finally decided that the answer had better be affirmative if Representative FEIGHAN's cooperation was to be obtained. The Congressman was duly notified it was OK.

That brought another big decision, this one in Congress. It was considered advisable that a subpoena from a congressional committee be sent with Representative FEIGHAN just in case it seemed proper—and Goleniewski thought so, too—for the latter to appear before a secret session on the Hill.

A subpoena was prepared. An appointment was set for several days later in New York.

Interviewed yesterday, after this reporter had checked facts from many sources over a 10-day period, Representative FEIGHAN said: "From the very beginning my main concern was for the safety of this man (Goleniewski). Everything else seemed secondary. I still have the same concern."

Representative FEIGHAN made the trip from Washington to New York with two congressional aids. They landed at LaGuardia Airport, and drove to an apartment building like a thousand others on Long Island.

A LASTING IMPRESSION

The handsome Pole made an impression that one has described as everlasting—I'll never forget it.

Sweet, harried looking and pregnant, his wife was in attendance part of the time. But all the time, striding energetically back and forth in the apartment, the former KGB bigshot painted the picture of what it feels like to flee the KGB only to find nothing coming from his leads and his liaison man with the CIA a Stalinist.

Bit by bit he unloaded the charges spelled out at the beginning of this story.

His trio of listeners were so shocked that they never got around to talk about the subpoena. Not one of them regarded the Pole as warped or biased. All knew that the CIA had been greatly served by him. They were staggered.

On his return to Washington, Representative FEIGHAN immediately arranged an appointment with CIA Director John A. McCone. He told him everything he had heard and urged him to look into the situation and correct it. Mr. McCone said he would.

One of the other men decided to make a return visit to Goleniewski. He brought the subpoena along (it was not from any committee to which Representative FEIGHAN belongs) and he also brought some Foreign Service rosters to enable him to interrogate the defector more explicitly.

VERY EAGER TO TESTIFY

This congressional aid obtained a second and more searching interview with the Pole. The latter also expressed his eagerness to testify in an executive session of any appropriate congressional committee. The subpoena was served.

A date and time was set for Goleniewski's appearance before the congressional committee. Representative FEIGHAN felt assured that whatever was wrong would soon be smoked out on the Hill.

But instead of that appearance, a man from the CIA arranged to have a key member of the committee involved vacate the subpoena and cancel the date. Another CIA man is reliably reported to have pressured the Army to investigate the subpoena server with a view toward charging him with making use of information gained on active duty (he was then on inactive duty), and for masquerading as an intelligence officer.

The Army was wrong on both counts. The aid didn't get the information on active duty, and he is an intelligence officer.

Word was quietly passed from somewhere that Mr. Goleniewski had flipped his lid and was becoming unreliable—so CIA doesn't think it worthwhile for him to appear before the legislative branch.

Asked about this yesterday, Representative FEIGHAN said:

"That's utterly ridiculous. The man seemed worried, and even excited, but his mind is in excellent shape. I was impressed by everything he had to say."

So were the two others.

Representative FEIGHAN added that "I cannot deny my role in bringing this case to the attention of Mr. McCone, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency."

Up to the moment, however, it doesn't seem to have done much good.

Though Goleniewski has been moved elsewhere to keep the Russians guessing, he has yet to tell his story to Congress. He has yet to see any real results, he says, from what he came here to tell us. He has yet to enjoy many of the blessings that reverted to him in theory when he obtained his American citizenship a few weeks ago. The bill got a fair wind from Representative FEIGHAN and his associates.

TREATMENT WON'T ENCOURAGE OTHERS

From the viewpoint of Goleniewski, the joys of his American liberation must seem oddly constrained. He is a prisoner of the

executive branch of our Government in a way few other citizens have been. He is more confined, more incommunicado, than he ever was before he bolted.

From a reporter's viewpoint, he seems to be a battered casualty of a war as savage and devious as the cold war. It's the war now raging in the upholstered jungle where different agents of our Government are stalking—and frequently opposing—each other.

One thing is sure. His plight is poor recruiting bait for more KGB defectors. Already two have been murdered or inexplicably killed after they arrived here. The mental ordeal to which Goleniewski has been subjected on this side of the Atlantic could ultimately prove to be the more refined kind of homicidal retribution. It leaves no evidence whatsoever.

The CIA? A spokesman said there would be no comment on the matter.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 3, 1964]

PROBE FOUR U.S. ENVOYS IN RED SPY SEX NET— STORY IN JOURNAL-AMERICAN SPURS ACTION (By Guy Richards)

Four American diplomats came under new and hastily organized congressional probes today after a high Soviet defector named them as Russian collaborators lured by beautiful Polish girls into a classic fall from grace.

The four, along with a fifth diplomat later allowed to resign, were drawn into the Soviet net in the espionage hotbed at Warsaw, Poland's capital, the defector charged. Ten U.S. Marine guards at the U.S. Embassy there also were trapped into collaborating with the Russians after clandestine affairs with Polish girls, the defector said.

Nor was that all.

SEDUCED BY AGENTS

While the diplomats were being black-mailed by the Polish girls, a handsome Soviet secret service agent bent on collecting information, managed to seduce the wife of an American Foreign Service officer.

And so gay and lax was the ambassadorial life in the lush Polish capital, the defector asserted, that while the American cats were out playing Soviet intelligence mice pilfered the Embassy's safe combinations, and probably made off with the Embassy cipher essential to decoding secret messages.

All that and more was under close scrutiny today as Congress turned its investigative spotlight on U.S. security leaks around the world.

QUICK ACTION

The investigations, marked by hurriedly scheduled hearings by several congressional committees, were spurred by exclusive revelations in yesterday's New York Journal-American.

The disclosures came from the Soviet defector, 41-year-old Michal Goleniewski, who bared the existence of "cells" of the KGB—the Soviet Secret Police—in Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department, both in Washington and in U.S. Embassies overseas.

Goleniewski, still in a CIA hideout, made these other startling revelations:

Three American scientists with access to classified material were KGB agents.

About \$1.2 million of CIA funds in Vienna was secretly passed along to the Communists.

All important embassies and agencies of the United States "except the FBI" had been infiltrated by at least one KGB operative.

Amateurs and Stalinists in the CIA have blocked Goleniewski's efforts to make his leads and information effective.

All told, then, several hundred U.S. employees around the world will come under the target sights which Goleniewski directly or indirectly, is going to provide Capitol Hill.

THREE HUNDRED RISKS

They will include 300 persons already tabbed as "grave security risks" who are still on the State Department payroll.

But the four diplomats cited by the defector, one a high-ranking KGB official, will draw first scrutiny for a very special reason.

They could provide a two-way look at the job yet to be done—a look inside the State Department as well as a look abroad. The latter would be via our once spy-riddled Embassy at Warsaw.

It is reasoned that a close scrutiny of the Warsaw case of 1960-61 would show how the four diplomats and the Foreign Service officer's wife were compromised; and how, later, after their exposure, they were saved by a magic wand waved from the State Department's command post in Foggy Bottom.

VITAL EMBASSY

Warsaw is an important Embassy for several reasons, but mostly because it is where the United States maintains direct contact with the Ambassador of Red China.

Goleniewski, it can now be revealed, was a stip—a stay-in-placer—in those days. He had sent a few messages to the CIA indicating he wanted to defect. He was told to stay in place, that he would be more useful as he was.

This imposed an additional worry on him—but the information he produced was sensational. It was a CIA ten-strike.

Of the five diplomats named by Goleniewski, one was allowed to resign. Everyone else in the case was simply shuttled elsewhere.

At a different time, Goleniewski fed in information which led to the arrest, conviction and sentence of Foreign Service Officer Irvin N. Scarbeck.

NEW CAREER

Shortly thereafter—though the CIA didn't want him over at the time—Goleniewski delivered himself up in West Germany. So ended his life as a KGB official with his own plane, able to fly anywhere he wanted in Soviet-bloc countries. And so began his career as a man leveling his finger at a roster of KGB agents on American payrolls.

The fact that he has been kept from testifying in secret before a congressional committee also was revealed by this newspaper yesterday. But nobody seems to know by whom.

PART OF RECORD

The story yesterday provoked U.S. Representative JOHN MILAN ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and sponsor of a recent bill calling for an investigation of the State Department, to say:

"I will have your story put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow.

"It demonstrates once again how the State Department is a privileged sanctuary riding out waves of criticism with arrogance and contempt for public opinion and the elected representatives of the people.

"Its record is one of failure and deceit. The time has come for a thorough house-cleaning."

Representative ASHBROOK said he hoped to be able to get Goleniewski to testify in secret before the Un-American Activities Committee. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee also has its eyes trained on the KGB defector.

FARLAND IGNORED

The Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress can be counted in on the act. They have perked up their interest in the recent flops of CIA and State abroad; especially the bumbling of both agencies in ignoring the counsel of our former Ambassador to Panama, Joseph S. Farland.

For months before his resignation last summer, Ambassador Farland had called the turn—and filed reports on—the widespread sabotage and revolutionary plots of Castro agents throughout the Caribbean, including Panama.

In the February 25 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Farland is quoted as follows:

"When I arrived home in August and the State Department circulated its customary notice to appropriate agencies listing returned ambassadors available for consultation, a man in the White House went to work.

"His name is Ralph Dungan. On whose authority he acted I do not know. But Mr. Dungan phoned the various agencies, including the Pentagon, that I was not to be invited for consultation."

ANOTHER QUOTE

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also quotes Mr. Farland as having been taken in hand on an earlier visit to Washington in the late fall of 1962 by Edwin Martin, then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs.

"Mr. Martin," Mr. Farland reported, "literally ordered me to have no contact with top CIA executives and any congressional leaders."

And Congress now is going to page Mr. Martin and Mr. Ralph Dungan, the mystery man who phoned from the White House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRUCE (at the request of Mr. HAL-LECK), beginning March 2, for indefinite period, on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. CHENOWETH, for balance of week, on account of official business with the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. NELSEN), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. NELSEN), for 30 minutes, Wednesday, March 4, 1964; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL and to include an editorial.

Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KILBURN and to include certain letters and statements.

Mr. ALBERT in two instances and to include a newspaper article in each.

Mr. LONG of Maryland and to include a part of the appeal brief filed on behalf of former Representative Johnson, of Maryland.

Mr. DUNCAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) and to include extraneous matter. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. NELSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.
Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.
Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.
Mr. HALL.
Mr. CEDERBERG in two instances.
Mr. CURTIS.
Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.
Mr. GLENN.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. NELSEN in two instances.
Mr. WIDNALL.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. WYDLER in three instances.
Mr. MCINTIRE.
Mr. SMITH of California.
Mr. MOORE in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. JONES of Alabama.
Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.
Mr. MULTER in three instances.
Mr. FOGARTY.
Mr. NIX.
Mr. LONG of Louisiana.
Mr. ADDABBO in three instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. KING of California.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 473. An act for the relief of Miss Wladyslaw Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1237. An act for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayo Fujimoto Howard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1597. An act for the relief of Julian Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotini Dimantopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1966. An act for the relief of Glenda Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1978. An act for the relief of Lillian P. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Francesco Mira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1985. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Cacciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1986. An act for the relief of Hattie Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9640. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 721. An act to amend section 124 of title 28, United States Code, to transfer Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton Counties from the Galveston division to the Houston division of the southern district of Texas.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 28, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8171. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1773. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Army as a result of awarding without competition a contract for overhaul and modification of aircraft engines; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1774. A letter from the President, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of Boys' Clubs of America for the year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9032. A bill to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control; with amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2040. An act to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1181). Referred to House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1203. A bill for the relief of Johanna Gristede; with amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2215. A bill for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2747. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. W. Gwin, Sr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Witold A. Lanowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6034. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6136. A bill for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6478. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6839. A bill for the relief of Helen J. Googins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6267. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son; with amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6883. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7346. A bill for the relief of Cornelius Van Nuis, doctor of medicine, U.S. Public Health Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8201. A bill for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, U.S. Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATTI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8532. A bill for the relief of Ivan D. Beran; without amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8936. A bill for the relief of Leonard M. Dalton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9280. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Kent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.